

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 15 and 19-22 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 15 and 19-22 stand rejected.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 15 and 19-22 is respectfully requested in view of the following:

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sainsbury et al (U.S. Patent 6,104,162) (Sainsbury hereinafter) in view of Wilcox et al (U.S. Patent 5,994,885) (Wilcox hereinafter) and in further view of Shyr et al (U.S. Patent 5,903,764) (Shyr hereinafter). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sainsbury in view of Hatular (U.S. Patent 6,184,660) (Hatular hereinafter) in further view of Wilcox and in further view of Shyr. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatular in view of Sainsbury in further view of Wilcox and in further view of Shyr.

Applicants traverse these rejections on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness as is required by 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Independent claim 1 requires, among other things, "providing a controller module included in an AC-DC adapter and operable to **receive the first feedback signal and the second feedback signal.**" Independent claims 12 and 22 require, among other things, "a controller module included in the AC-DC adapter and operable to **receive a first feedback signal input** indicative of a target voltage required by a load **and a second feedback signal input** indicative of the second DC output." Emphasis added.

The rejection of December 21, 2006 states in part that "Sainsbury discloses . . . providing a controller module (Figure 5) included in an AC-DC adapter (Figure 3, element 22) and operable to receive the first feed back signal (Column 5, lines 17-21) and the second feedback [signal] (Column 5, lines 1-2). . ." The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Advisory Action mailed March 20, 2007 clearly states that "the controller, which is the **auto-voltage selector** is located within the AC-DC adaptor housing as disclosed in Sainsbury '162 figure [sp] 3, **item 26**. The **Vsense** and **Vsel** can be considered as the **first and second feedback signals** which are read in the system." Emphasis added.

The only references found of Vsense and Vsel during a quick search of Sainsbury are in Figure 5 and Column 4, line 51 through Column 4, line 2. Here, Sainsbury states "[t]he power transistor 33 [NOT the auto-voltage selector 26] is biased by the voltage follower 32 [the part

that **receives** the **Vsense** and **Vsel**] based on the reference voltage **Vsel** and feedback voltage **Vsense**, which measures the actual voltage delivered to the output connectors." Thus, it is the voltage follower 32 that receives **Vsense** and **Vsel**, NOT the auto-voltage selector 26. Additionally, Sainsbury states beginning in column 4, line 51 that the "[a]uto voltage selector 26 as shown in Fig. 5 **delivers** [NOT receives] a precision reference voltage **Vsel to** [NOT from] the solid state power monitor 27." Emphasis added. Therefore, Sainsbury does NOT teach either "providing a controller module included in an AC-DC adapter and operable to **receive the first feedback signal and the second feedback signal**" as required by independent claim 1 or "a controller module included in the AC-DC adapter and operable to **receive a first feedback signal input** indicative of a target voltage required by a load **and a second feedback signal input** indicative of the second DC output" as required by independent claims 12 and 22. Emphasis added. To the contrary, Sainsbury teaches in the specification and in Figure 5 that the auto voltage selector 26 delivers the **Vsel** feedback to the voltage follower 32 of the power monitor 27 and it is the voltage follower 32 that also receives the feedback **Vsense** from the output connectors 37 and 38. Thus, it is the voltage follower 32 that receives both **Vsel** and **Vsense**, not the voltage selector 26, as indicated by the Office Action and the Advisory Action mentioned above.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP §2142:

The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.

The USPTO clearly cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in connection with the amended claims for at least these reasons:

35 U.S.C. §103(a) provides that:

[a] patent may not be obtained...if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Thus, when evaluating a claim for obviousness, all claim limitations must be evaluated (i.e. disclosed by the references).

Therefore, because all the limitations of the claims at issue are NOT found in the cited references, as stated above, independent claims 1, 12 and 22 are submitted to be allowable and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 3-6 and 8-10 depend from and further limit independent claim 1, and dependent claims 12, 14, 15, 19 -21 depend from and further limit independent claim 12, and are submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 15 and 19-22 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an Notice of Allowance for the remaining claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Bart A. Fisher  
Registration No. 55,181

Dated: 4-9-2007  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789  
Telephone: 512.867.8458  
Facsimile: 214.200.0853  
ipdocketing@haynesboone.com

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, via EFS-Web, on the date indicated below:	
on	<u>April 9, 2007</u>
Date	<u>by Kim Reyes</u>
	Kim Reyes